arXiv:hep-ph/0305241v2 4 Jul 2003

MIT-CTP-3378
YITP-SB-03-21
LA-UR-03-2054
hep-ph/0305241

Problems of the rotating-torsion-balance limit on the photon mass

Alfred Scharff Goldhaber*[1] and Michael Martin Nieto†[2]

*Center for Theoretical Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139
and
†Theoretical Division (T-8, MS-B285)
University of California
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, NM 87545

PACS numbers: 12.20Fv, 14.70Bh, 98.80Cq

Abstract

We discuss the problems (and the promise) of the ingenious method introduced by Lakes, and recently improved on by Luo, to detect a possible small photon mass μ by measuring the ambient magnetic vector potential from large scale magnetic fields. We also point out how an improved "indirect" limit can be obtained using modern measurements of astrophysical magnetic fields and plasmas and that a good "direct" limit exists using properties of the solar wind.

[1]goldhab@insti.physics.sunysb.edu, on leave from C.N. Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics, State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3840
[2]mmn@lanl.gov

Recently Luo et al.[1] improved an ingenious method of Lakes [2] to detect a possible small photon mass μ. In the Proca (μ = constant) formulation, nonzero μ fixes the Lorentz gauge for electrodynamics, and thus makes unique the vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ at any point due to specified sources. The $\mu^2 A^2$ Proca term in the Lagrangian implies a torque on a loop of magnetic flux from the ambient magnetic vector potential $\mathbf{A}_{\rm amb}$, analogous to the torque on a loop of electric current from an ambient magnetic field. The torque $\boldsymbol{\tau}=\boldsymbol{\nu}\times\mu^2\mathbf{A}_{\rm amb}$ acts on $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, the 'vector-potential dipole moment' of the flux loop. As one knows $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, measuring or limiting $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ yields $(\mu^2\mathbf{A}_{\rm amb})$. Determining $\mathbf{A}_{\rm amb}$ then places a value on μ.

A typical value of $\mathbf{A}_{\rm amb}$ in a given region can be very large, $A \sim |\langle\mathbf{B}\rangle|L$ (where L is a characteristic size of the region over which $\mathbf{B}$ is approximately uniform). Even small $\langle\mathbf{B}\rangle$ can be overcome by large enough L to give large $A_{\rm amb}$, hence low μ.

Lakes [2] already noted a source of statistical error – at any particular location within a large region of approximately uniform $\mathbf{B}$ (whose exact boundaries are poorly specified), one knows neither the direction nor the magnitude of $\mathbf{A}_{\rm amb}$. Lakes looked for diurnal variation in the torque on his toroidal magnet. So, for $\mathbf{A}$ closely aligned with the rotation axis of the Earth, he would have been insensitive to μ. The new improvement [1] was rotating the axis of the magnet, allowing detection of all projections of $\mathbf{A}$, and also 100 times greater sensitivity to the signal thanks to a new, adjustable rotation frequency for lock-in detection. Eliminating the angular ambiguity reduces the statistical uncertainty in the Lakes method by roughly a factor $\sqrt{2}$. Refs. [1, 2] do not account for this uncertainty explicitly in their quoted limits.

Though original and potentially promising for the future, these works [1, 2] neither provide the best available limit on $\mu^2 A$ nor a reliable limit at all on μ.

(1) For specified sources the Proca equation in vacuum implies exponential Yukawa damping of the magnetic vector potential and field on the scale of the reduced photon Compton wavelength $\lambda\!\!\!^{-}_C = 1/\mu$. However, in the presence of plasma a static magnetic field may take exactly the form it would have in $\mu = 0$ magnetohydrodynamics, *provided* [3, 4] the plasma supports a current $\mathbf{J}$ that exactly cancels the 'pseudocurrent' $-\mu^2\mathbf{A}/\mu_0$ induced by the photon mass. Thus, if we place a limit on plasma currents everywhere in a region larger than some putative value of $1/\mu$, we place the same limit on $\mu^2 A$.

(2) Using the above, we can obtain a stronger limit. For the largest available A (coming from a typical **B** over the dimensions of clusters like Coma [5, 6]), we require a limit on the intergalactic plasma current, obtainable from the same astrophysical data used in [1, 2] to estimate A. The mean electron density is ≤ 0.01 cm^{-3} [6]. The electron temperature is about 5 keV (higher in places) [6], yielding a (more than generous!) velocity bound on the order of 0.1 c. This allows a current density $< 5 \times 10^{-8}$ A/m^2, roughly a factor 200 smaller than the pseudocurrent allowed by the result of Luo et al. [1]. This current density limit of course applies everywhere, including all places where A has its typical size. The resulting limit for $\hbar\mu/c$ is about 10^{-52} g, or $\lambda\!\!\!^{-}_C > 4 \times 10^9$ km, almost 30 Astronomical Units. Uncertainty about the degree of inhomogeneity in Coma or even in in our local galactic cluster makes it hard to quote a definite result, but it is unlikely to be worse than the claim of [1].

(3) Of course, anywhere the plasma density becomes unusually small, including any large vacancies in the plasma allowed by our ignorance about inhomogeneity [6], the vacuum exponential decay applies. If we happened to be in such a vacancy then A at our location could be arbitrarily small, and hence the lab limit on $\mu^2 A$ would give no constraint on μ.

(4) Although the torque method cannot yet yield a solid limit on μ, surely the true limit is smaller than that from the best direct observations, but we have no clear idea by how much. The best direct limit we know comes from Ryutov [7], (who used a generous upper bound on the $\mu^2 A^2$ energy of the solar wind magnetic field), $\mu < 10^{-49}$ g or $\lambda\!\!\!^{-}_C = 3\times!0^6$ km, about 5 solar radii [8].

We thank Philipp Kronberg for information on intergalactic fields and plasma and Bill Feldman, Peter Gary, and Jack Gosling for information on the solar wind. This work was supported by NSF grant PHY-0140192 and US DOE grant DF-FC02-94ER40818 (ASG) and also by US DOE contract W-7405-ENG-36 (MMN).

References

[1] J. Luo, L.-C. Tu, Zh.-K. Hu, and E.-J. Luan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 081801 (2003).

[2] R. Lakes, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1826 (1998).

[3] E. Williams and D. Park, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26**, 1651 (1971).

[4] A. S. Goldhaber and M. M. Nieto, Rev. Mod. Phys. **43**, 277 (1971).

[5] E. Asseo and H. Sol, Phys. Rep. **148**, 307 (1987).

[6] P . P. Kronberg, Rep. Prog. Phys. **57**, 325 (1994); Physics Today **55**, No. 12, 40 (2002).

[7] D. D. Ryutov, Plasma Phys. Control. Fusion **39**, A73 (1997).

[8] E. Adelberger, G. Dvali, and A. Gruzinov, hep-ph/0306245, observe that if a dynamical photon mass arose from a new Higgs mechanism (besides the standard model electroweak Higgs), the usual methods of limiting a fixed Proca mass, including [1, 2, 7], might not apply.